



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION AND ITS EXPRESSION IN RITUAL. Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace, October, 1900. Edited by HENRY WACE. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1900. Pp. 96.

THE growth of ritualism in the English established church, and the causes of it, are clearly illustrated in this "Report." That a representative body of church scholars and leaders should be invited to a conference by the bishop of London and spend several days in discussing the character of the Lord's Supper and its relation to ritual indicates forcibly what is uppermost today in ecclesiastical and theological church circles. Only a few months earlier a similar conference had been held at Oxford through the efforts of Dr. Sanday, including, however, a wider representation of the different evangelical sects, for the discussion of the same question. Numerous books have been issued within the past few years, notably one by Canon Gore, on the same theme.

The notable feature of these conferences and publications is their thoroughgoing mediævalism. One is translated at once into the atmosphere and thinking of the Middle Ages. It takes a little time for the reader to accustom himself to the fact that these men are all Protestants in name and members of a church that is the historical heritage of the English Reformation. In fact, all the members of the conference at Fulham Palace, whatever may be said of minor differences, were united in holding the traditional dogmas of the church in pre-Reformation times. In the settlement of questions concerning the nature and effect of Christ's death and sacrifice, of Christian priesthood and its sacrificial character, of the meaning and grace-giving power of the Lord's Supper as a rite of Christian worship, the appeal of the conference was on all sides to church authority and to antiquity. No Catholic could go farther. The great Protestant appeal to individual and private judgment as given in Christian consciousness apparently had no place. This slavish deference to ecclesiastical authority is perhaps the most suggestive feature in the account of the conference, and shows whither English church leadership is tending. Such men as Dr. Sanday and Canon Gore are scholars and critics. But what shall be said of a discussion in which the note of historical criticism, squarely applied to scriptural exegesis and to the origins of Christianity, is conspicuous only by its absence? Let it be said, however, that one of the most pleasant features of the conference was the complete liberty given to the discussion within certain fixed bounds,

and the evident Christian spirit which seemed to prevail. It was this that especially distinguished it from any like conference in the eleventh or sixteenth century. In truth, such a meeting as that at Fulham Palace would have been impossible in earlier times. When St. Bernard met Abelard at the synod of Sens, he refused to discuss the theological questions at issue, but appealed to church authority. "The doctrines of faith," he said, "had been settled once for all, and must not be made to depend on human disputation." The inconclusive and sad result of the conference between Luther and Zwingli at Marburg on the very questions that were considered at Fulham Palace is another conspicuous example. But leaving out of view the freer air that was breathed throughout this conference held on the very border of the twentieth century, it stands dogmatically on the same ground with all the ancient councils, appealing to external dogmatic authority as the sole basis and standard of individual faith, and hence holding that uniformity of faith is essential to the completely realized kingdom of God. This is simply the old Catholicism, whatever name be given it, and if these recent conferences be accepted as evidence, there can be no doubt as to the direction that the Church of England today is taking. On the whole, the judgment of a French critic in a review of Dr. Sanday's account of the Oxford conference in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions* may be accepted as essentially true: "Certain it is that the ritualistic conception seems to be more in harmony with the tendencies which actually predominate among the English people than the spiritualistic conception. This last, more liberal than the other, may experience the same disfavor as liberalism in the political domain." May it not be added that it is the great and growing body of English dissenters that forms the real buttress of English Protestant political and religious liberties?

LEVI L. PAINE.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ALBRECHT RITSCHL'S ANSCHAUUNG VOM EVANGELISCHEN GLAUBEN UND LEBEN. Von EBERHARD VISCHER. Tübingen: Mohr, 1900. Pp. 36. M. 0.75.

PROFESSOR HILTY, in Bern, had complained that Protestant theology was not in contact with Protestant churches, with even the educated among the laity. "What have we had," he asks, "from the whole Ritschlian academic controversy, which excites you theologians so? Among hundreds of non-theologians scarcely one has even a remote